# 6F

## Information/Action

*Professional Services Committee*

## Single Subject Matter Program Review Update

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item provides an update on the progress in reviewing single subject matter programs and describes the current review and approval processes.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission provide direction to staff regarding the review and approval of single subject matter programs.

**Presenter:** Helen Hawley, Consultant, and Teri Clark, Administrator, Professional Services Division

**Strategic Plan Goal: 1**

**Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates.

# Single Subject Matter Program Review Update

**Introduction**

This agenda item has two parts. The first part of the item provides an update on the current single subject matter program review process and a plan for completing the reviews on programs already submitted to the Commission. The second part of the item describes the currently adopted procedures used to review Phase I (English, mathematics, science and social science) and Phase II (art, music, languages other than English (LOTE), and physical education) single subject matter programs and seeks direction as to whether the Commission would like to make modifications to those procedures.

**Part 1:  Update on Single Subject Program Review Progress**

At the May/June 2006 Commission meeting, the Commission approved eleven single subject matter preparation programs and heard an update on the progress of the single subject matter program review process.  The Commission directed staff to return at the July/August 2006 meeting with another update on the review process and a plan to address the review of subject matter programs that have been submitted thus far.

To date, 26 new single subject matter programs from Phase I have been approved by the Commission in the content areas of English, mathematics, science and social science (See Table 1). These programs can now accept candidates to their new subject matter programs that are aligned with the K-12 student content standards. The prior subject matter programs at the institutions with approved Phase I SB 2042 subject matter programs are now operating only to allow previously admitted candidates to complete their program.  There have been no single subject matter programs approved from the Phase II subjects to date.

Since 2004, over 140 single subject matter program documents have had an initial review. Of those, 45 programs have resubmitted additional information and 35 of these submissions have been reviewed by the readers. An additional 15 programs have resubmitted a second time, and 12 of those have already been reviewed. However, over 60 of the programs that were initially reviewed in the last year and that received feedback from the readers have not yet been resubmitted by the program sponsor.  It is important to understand that the program review process is an iterative process and that the program documents and even the programs are modified during the review process.  Reviewers ask questions of the program sponsor and help guide the sponsor to develop and describe a program that meets all the adopted standards.

**Table 1: Single Subject Programs and Reviewers** (July 10, 2006)

| Phase I | Standards Approved | Total Programs Submitted | Programs Approved | Programs Currently in the Review Process | Programs Waiting to Begin the Review Process |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| English | January 2003 | 32 | 8 | 24 | 0 |
| Math | | 35 | 11 | 22 | 2 |
| Science | | 26 | 1 | 24 | 1 |
| Social Studies | | 24 | 6 | 16 | 2 |
| Phase II | | | | | |
| LOTE | May 2004 | 15 | 0 | 12 | 3 |
| Art | | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| PE | | 13 | 0 | 9 | 4 |
| Music | | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Totals | | 161 | 26 | 123 | 12 |

As of June 1, 2006 there were 79 trained reviewers across the eight single subject areas in Phases I and II. However the number of programs which each reviewer can manage varies depending on factors such as the prior experience of the reviewer, the reviewer's other responsibilities and commitments, and the time available for performing the review. Because of the need for consistency across reviewers and reviewer judgments about subject matter program responses, there is an expectation that each reviewer commit to reviewing at least several documents over a period of at least two years. Nevertheless, conditions may often arise that prevent a reviewer from completing a review in as timely a manner as desirable. Prior Commission practice had been to provide "protected" time for reviewers by conducting review meetings at a location away from the reviewers' workplace. This process assured a more timely response from reviewers regarding program documents, and thus a more timely response back to the institution. However, this process was discontinued several years ago in response to the state's fiscal crisis and a new process that incorporated an extended use of technology was instituted instead. Although this process allowed the review of program documents to continue, the loss of "protected" review time has had a major impact on the efficiency of the review process. Even in the instance where protected time is provided, it occasionally happens that a reviewer may be unexpectedly called upon by employers to take on other competing professional tasks, a situation which can also precipitate untimely delays in completing reviews.

More recently, however, and in response to Commission direction at the June 2006 meeting, program staff held six review meetings to train new single subject program reviewers, and to begin reviewing documents using protected time (see Table 2). The following chart documents these meetings and the progress made. Twenty-three new reviewers have been trained and are now reading documents as a result of the June review activities.

**Table 2: Single Subject Program Review Activities in June 2006**

| Dates | Subject(s) | Reviewers | | Total documents reviewed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Newly Trained | Previously Trained | |
| June 5-6 | Science | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| June 12-13 | PE | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| June 15-16 | Music & Art | 9 | 0 | 3 |
| June 19-20 | Science, LOTE, music, math, social science | 8 | 13 | 16 |
| June 22-23 | Music & LOTE | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| June 29-30 | PE | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| | | 29 | 16 | 29 |

A total of 29 program documents had an initial review in June. There are still a few new program documents that have been submitted and have not been reviewed yet, largely because there are not enough reviewers available particularly in the areas of science, social science, LOTE and physical education. It is expected that Phase I and Phase II documents will continue to be submitted for review but at a slower rate over the next years.

*Proposal for 2006-07 Phase I and II Program Reviews*

In the past, two meetings were held annually in Sacramento for subject matter program reviews. Those were each two-day meetings attended by dozens of reviewers whose expenses were paid and time was protected while they worked on reviews. Because of the reduction in Commission resources, these supported meetings were eliminated several years ago. Instead a single two-day training and distance electronic reviews became the model for initial review. Staff found that this mechanism works well for resubmission after the major issues and concerns of the review team are identified. However, the complexity and importance of the initial review seems to be more effective and more efficient with a face-to face process. Therefore, for the 2006-2007 year, staff is proposing holding two day training-reading sessions at regional meetings around the state.

Two program review meetings will be held in southern California. In addition, staff will continue with "rolling" meetings in Sacramento over the next year to address both current submissions that still need reviewers and expected new submissions. A consultant would need to coordinate and facilitate the meetings. One or more support persons would need to participate in planning and coordination (hotel arrangements, travel claims, meeting materials, etc.). Reviewers' expenses would be paid for the two days: travel, lodging, and per diem. One meeting would be held in fall 2006 and one meeting would be held in early spring 2007 in southern California.

*Budget Estimate for Review Meetings*

The budget estimate for conducting all of the various review meetings planned for 2006-07 is $34,720. This figure includes all of the meetings to train new reviewers and review additional Phase I and Phase II programs, as well as funds to begin the review process for new submissions for Phase III programs, assuming that the Commission approves the proposed Phase III subject

matter program standards being presented in another agenda item (PSC 6G) at the current Commission meeting.


**Part 2: Description of the current review procedures for Phase I and II subject matter programs**

This section of the agenda item reviews the single subject matter program implementation procedures that have taken place for Phase I (English, mathematics, science and social science) and Phase II (art, music, languages other than English [LOTE], and physical education) of the Single Subject Matter Program Standards adoption process.

## A. Background

All preliminary teaching credential candidates must both satisfy a subject matter requirement and complete a program of professional preparation prior to being granted a teaching credential. The subject matter requirement for single subject credential candidates may be satisfied by completion of a Commission-approved subject matter program or passage of a Commission-approved subject matter examination. Education Code §443311 requires the Commission to evaluate any subject matter program offered by an accredited institution to prepare credentialed teachers. Program sponsors who have received initial institutional accreditation from the Commission are eligible to submit programs of subject matter preparation for review and approval.

Senate Bill 2042 required the Commission to develop and adopt new subject matter program standards that are aligned with the California K-12 academic content standards. Prior to developing program standards or the new CSET examinations, subject matter requirements (SMRs) aligned with the K-12 standards were developed and subsequently adopted by the Commission to guide both the examination and program standards development. Then program standards and examinations were developed based upon the adopted SMRs.


| K-12 Academic Content Standards→ | Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs)→ | Subject Matter Program Standards and Examinations |
| --- | --- | --- |


| Phase 1 Subject Areas | Phase 2 Subject Areas | Phase 3 Subject Areas |
| --- | --- | --- |
| • English | • Art | • Agriculture |
| • Mathematics | • Music | • Business |
| • Science | • Languages other than | • Health |
| • Social Science |   English (LOTE) | • Home economics |
|  | • Physical Education | • Industrial and technology education |
|  |  | • LOTE: American Sign Language (ASL) |
| Adoption: January 2003 | Adoption: May 2004 | *Adoption: September 2006 (scheduled)* |

When the Commission adopts new standards, it also approves an implementation plan for the transition to the new standards.

The Phase I implementation plan approved in 2003 by the Commission may be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2003-01/january_2003_PREP-3.pdf. The Phase II implementation plan adopted by the Commission in May 2004 may be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2004-05/may-2004-6C.pdf. The Phase III Standards for Single Subject Matter Programs in the subject areas of agriculture, business, health, home economics, industrial and technology education, and LOTE: American Sign Language (ASL) will be presented for information later in this meeting and then for adoption at the September 2006 Commission meeting.

According to the implementation schedule previously adopted by the Commission, once an institution has an approved SB 2042 undergraduate subject matter program, candidates cannot be allowed to enter the subject matter programs that were approved under the prior standards.

**Table 3: Timeline for Single Subject Matter Standards Implementation**

| Activities | Phase I | Phase II |
|---|---|---|
| Standards adopted | January 2003 | May 2004 |
| Technical assistance statewide | April-May 2003 | August 2004 |
| Selection and training of reviewers | July-October 2003 | October 2004 |
| Begin reviewing program documents | October 2003 | October 2004 |
| Last date to enter the subject matter program based on the prior standards | July 1, 2005 | July 1, 2006 |
| Last date the program based on the prior standards will waive the subject matter requirement | July 1, 2009 | July 1, 2010 |

**B. Current Subject Matter Program Review Process and Procedures**

Following are the general procedures for the review of new subject matter programs:

1. Technical Assistance – After the Commission adopts a set of new program standards, Commission staff members provide technical assistance to prospective program sponsors wishing to submit responses to the new standards. Technical assistance materials are provided on the Commission's website. Staff members train, assign, and coordinate review teams.

2. Preconditions Review – After the program proposal is received, Commission staff review the sponsor's response to the preconditions which are based on state laws and Commission policies that address minimum unit and content area requirements. If the preconditions response is incomplete, the sponsor is requested to provide specific information necessary for compliance with the preconditions.

3. Program Review Process–The program sponsor's responses to the Commission's subject matter program standards are reviewed by a team of two or more subject matter educators to determine if the program meets the program standards, including the SMRs. Reviewers are trained in the alignment of the standards and subject matter requirements and in the review process before they are assigned proposals to review. Reviewers are instructed to find explicit evidence that programs are not only aligned with K-12 content standards but also introduce their candidates to those standards within the context of their subject matter studies. The review team must reach consensus that each standard is met based upon evidence provided in the document. If the program does not meet the standards, the sponsor is given an explanation of the findings and guidance as to what additional information is needed in order for the reviewers to determine that the standard has been met. The sponsor may then submit the additional information requested. Once reviewers determine that the program proposal provides a convincing and adequate body of evidence to meet all of the Commission's adopted subject matter program standards, the program application is presented for approval by the Commission.

After subject matter program approval is granted by the Commission, the institution may accept candidates in the new, approved subject matter program. Graduates of a Commission-approved single subject matter preparation program meet the Commission's subject matter requirement and are not required to take the subject matter examination (CSET).

## C. Request for Commission Direction

At the December 2005 meeting, the Commission expressed an interest in reconsidering the program review process as a whole, as well as a particular interest in making more explicit the connection and the alignment between the content of the subject matter program requirements (SMRs) and the K-12 academic content standards For example, the Commission discussed the possible use of a matrix within the institution's program responses that would show the alignment between the K-12 academic content standards and subject matter program courses, assignments, and assessments. Included in Appendix A is a portion of a sample matrix that program sponsors could be required to submit with the program document. Staff is seeking direction regarding the how or if the Commission wishes to proceed with a reconsideration and/or modification of the review and approval process for single subject matter programs.

**Possible Commission Actions**

1. The Commission could choose to make no modifications to the single subject matter standards review and approval procedures and process.

2. The Commission could modify the review and approval procedures (i.e. request additional information including a matrix) for

   a. Future single subject matter standards adoptions, i.e. Phase III or other future single subject matter standards.

   b. Phase I and II programs that have not yet submitted documents to the Commission, effective January 1, 2007.

# Appendix A


# Possible Matrix showing Alignment between K-12 Student Content Standards, Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs), and Course Offerings

# English Single Subject Matter Review Form

| Standard # | K-12 Standard | Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs) | Course #s | Y/N | Reviewers' Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DOMAIN** | **READING** | | | | |
| **STRAND** | **1.0 WORD ANALYSIS, FLUENCY, AND SYSTEMATIC VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT   Students apply their knowledge of word origins to determine the meaning of new words encountered in reading materials and use those words accurately.** | | | | |
| **Substrand:  Vocabulary and Concept Development** | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Identify and use the literal and figurative meanings of words and understand word derivations. | 2.1 Human Language Structures | | | |
| | | a. Recognize the nature of human language, differences among languages, the universality of linguistic structures, and change across time, locale, and communities | | | |
| | | b. Demonstrate knowledge of word analysis, including sound patterns (phonology) and inflection, derivation, compounding, roots and affixes (morphology) | | | |
| | | c. Demonstrate knowledge of sentence structures (syntax), word and sentence meanings (semantics), and language function in communicative context (pragmatics) | | | |
| | | d. Use appropriate print and electronic sources to research etymologies; recognize conventions of English orthography and changes in word meaning and pronunciation. | | | |
| | | 2.2.a. Explain the influences of cognitive, affective, and sociocultural factors on language acquisition and development | | | |

## English Single Subject Matter Review Form

| Standard # | K-12 Standard | Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs) | Course #s | Y/N | Reviewers' Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.2 | Distinguish between the denotative and connotative meanings of words and interpret the connotative power of words. | 2.2.b. Explain the influence of a first language on second language development | | | |
| 1.3 | Identify Greek, Roman, and Norse mythology and use the knowledge to understand the origin and meaning of new words (e.g., the word *narcissistic* drawn from the myth of Narcissus and Echo). | 2.2.c. Describe methods and techniques for developing academic literacy (e.g., tapping prior knowledge through semantic mapping, word analogies, and cohesion analysis) | | | |
| **2.0 READING COMPREHENSION (FOCUS ON INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS)** Students read and understand grade-level-appropriate material. They analyze the organizational patterns, arguments, and positions advanced. The selections in Recommended Literature, Grades Nine Through Twelve (1990) illustrate the quality and complexity of the materials to be read by students. In addition, by grade twelve, students read two million words annually on their own, including a wide variety of classic and contemporary literature, magazines, newspapers, and online information. In grades nine and ten, students make substantial progress toward this goal. | | | | | |
| | **Substrand: Structural Features of Informational Materials** | | | | |
| 2.1 | Analyze the structure and format of functional workplace documents, including the graphics and headers, and explain how authors use the features to achieve their purposes. | 1.4.b. Evaluate structure and content of a variety of consumer, workplace, and public documents. | | | |
| | | 3.2.a. Recognize and use a variety of writing applications (e.g., short story, biographical, autobiographical, expository, persuasive, business and technical documents, historical investigation) | | | |
| | | 3.2.b. Demonstrate awareness of audience, purpose, and context | | | |
| | | 3.2.c. Recognize and use various text structures (e.g., narrative and non-narrative organizational patterns) | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Single Subject Matter Review Form** | | | | |
| **Standard #** | **K-12 Standard** | **Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs)** | **Course #s** | **Y/N** | **Reviewers' Comments** |
| 2.2 | Prepare a bibliography of reference materials for a report using a variety of consumer, workplace, and public documents. | 3.5.c. Identify and use multiple resources (e.g., oral, print, electronic; primary and secondary), and critically evaluate the quality of the sources | | | |
| | | 3.5.e. Use professional conventions and ethical standards of citation and attribution | | | |
| **Substrand: Comprehension and Analysis of Grade-Level-Appropriate Text** | | | | |
| 2.3 | Generate relevant questions about readings on issues that can be researched. | 2.3.b. Describe and explain cognitive elements of reading and writing processes (e.g., decoding and encoding, construction of meaning, recognizing and using text conventions of different genres) | | | |
| | | 2.3.c. Explain metacognitive strategies for making sense of text (e.g., pre-reading activities, predicting, questioning, word analysis, and concept formation) | | | |
| | | 3.5.a. Develop and apply research questions | | | |
| | | 3.5.b. Demonstrate methods of inquiry and investigation | | | |
| 2.4 | Synthesize the content from several sources or works by a single author dealing with a single issue; paraphrase the ideas and connect them to other sources and related topics to demonstrate comprehension. | 3.5.d. Interpret and apply findings | | | |

## English Single Subject Matter Review Form

| Standard # | K-12 Standard | Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs) | Course #s | Y/N | Reviewers' Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.5 | Extend ideas presented in primary or secondary sources through original analysis, evaluation, and elaboration. | 4.4.b. Understand and apply processes and techniques that enhance the impact of the creative writing product (e.g., work-shopping, readings, recasting of genre, voice, and perspective) | | | |
| 2.6 | Demonstrate use of sophisticated learning tools by following technical directions (e.g., those found with graphic calculators and specialized software programs and in access guides to World Wide Web sites on the Internet). | 3.1.d. Integrate a variety of software applications (e.g., databases, graphics, and spreadsheets) to produce print documents and multi-media presentations | | | |
| | | 3.5.f. Demonstrate effective presentation methods, including multi-media formats | | | |
| | **Substrand: Expository Critique** | | | | |
| 2.7 | Critique the logic of functional documents by examining the sequence of information and procedures in anticipation of possible reader misunderstandings. | 1.4.b. Evaluate structure and content of a variety of consumer, workplace, and public documents | | | |
| | | 1.4.c. Interpret individual works in their cultural, social, and political contexts | | | |
| 2.8 | Evaluate the credibility of an author's argument or defense of a claim by critiquing the relationship between generalizations and evidence, the | 3.2.a. Recognize and use a variety of writing applications (e.g., short story, biographical, autobiographical, expository, persuasive, business and technical documents, historical investigation) | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <td colspan="6" align="center">**English Single Subject Matter Review Form**</td> | | | | | |
| **Standard #** | **K-12 Standard** | **Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs)** | **Course #s** | **Y/N** | **Reviewers' Comments** |
| | comprehensiveness of evidence, and the way in which the author's intent affects the structure and tone of the text (e.g., in professional journals, editorials, political speeches, primary source material). | 3.2.d.  Apply critical thinking strategies to evaluate methods of persuasion, including but not limited to types of appeal and persuasion, logical fallacies, advertising techniques, logical argument, and classical argument | | | |
| | | 3.3.a. Employ precise and extensive vocabulary and effective diction to control voice, style, and tone | | | |
| <td colspan="6">**3.0  LITERARY RESPONSE and ANALYSIS   Students read and respond to historically or culturally significant works of literature that reflect and enhance their studies of history and social science. They conduct in-depth analyses of recurrent patterns and themes. The selections in Recommended Literature, Grades Nine Through Twelve illustrate the quality and complexity of the materials to be read by students.**</td> | | | | | |
| | <td colspan="5">**Substrand:  Structural Features of Literature**</td> | | | | |
| 3.1 | Articulate the relationship between the expressed purposes and the characteristics of different forms of dramatic literature (e.g., comedy, tragedy, drama, dramatic monologue). | 1.2.c. Articulate the relationship between the expressed purposes and the characteristics of different forms of dramatic literature (e.g., comedy, tragedy, drama, and dramatic monologue) | | | |
| 3.2 | Compare and contrast the presentation of a similar theme or topic across genres to explain how the selection of genre shapes the theme or topic. | 1.2.a. Distinguish salient features of genres (e.g., short stories, non-fiction, drama, poetry, and novel) | | | |
| | | 1.3.a. Research and apply criticism of major texts and authors using print and/or electronic resources | | | |
| | <td colspan="5">**Substrand:  Narrative Analysis of Grade-Level-Appropriate Text**</td> | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Single Subject Matter Review Form** | | | | | |
| **Standard #** | **K-12 Standard** | **Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs)** | **Course #s** | **Y/N** | **Reviewers' Comments** |
| 3.3 | Analyze interactions between main and subordinate characters in a literary text (e.g., internal and external conflicts, motivations, relationships, influences) and explain the way those interactions affect the plot. | 1.1.c. Describe the salient features of adolescent/Young Adult literature | | | |
| 3.4 | Determine characters' traits by what the characters say about themselves in narration, dialogue, dramatic monologue, and soliloquy. | 1.2.a. Distinguish salient features of genres (e.g., short stories, non-fiction, drama, poetry, and novel) | | | |
| 3.5 | Compare works that express a universal theme and provide evidence to support the ideas expressed in each work. | 1.2.b. Define and analyze basic elements of literature (e.g., plot, setting, character, point of view, theme, narrative structure, figurative language, tone, diction, and style) | | | |
| 3.6 | Analyze and trace an author's development of time and sequence, including the use of complex literary devices (e.g., foreshadowing, flashbacks). | 1.2.c. Articulate the relationship between the expressed purposes and the characteristics of different forms of dramatic literature (e.g., comedy, tragedy, drama, and dramatic monologue) | | | |